

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

ANNIE PERRY,

Plaintiff,

v.

LEGACY EMANUEL HOSPITAL &
HEALTH CENTER, an Oregon non-profit
corporation,

Defendant.

No. CV 08-850-HU

OPINION AND ORDER

MOSMAN, J.,

On December 4, 2008, Magistrate Judge Hubel issued Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") (#13) in the above-captioned case granting plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint (#8) and recommending that plaintiff's Motion for Remand (#8) be GRANTED. No objection to the F&R was filed.

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or

recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Hubel's recommendation, and I ADOPT the F&R (#13) as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 8th day of January, 2009.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Court